REMARKS

Claims 15, 19, 21-27 and 35-39 are pending. Applicant has amended claims 15, 22-25, and 27; canceled claims 16-18, 20 and 28-34; and added claims 35-39.

The Examiner has rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended claim 15 to address the Examiner's concern.

The Examiner has rejected claims 15, 19, and 21-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker and Steele. Although applicant disagrees, applicant has amended the claims to further clarify the claimed invention.

Applicant's technique allows nodes of a network graph to be magnified when a mouse pointer points to a node or a predefined region. When applicant's technique detects such pointing by the mouse pointer, it determines whether the node is displayed with a scaling factor that is below a threshold. The threshold may be set to indicate the smallest scaling factor at which text of the node is comprehensible to a user. Thus, when the text of the node is not comprehensible, the node is magnified so that it is comprehensible. Applicant's technique may wait to magnify a node until the mouse pointer is over the node more than a threshold amount of time. Applicant's technique may also return the node to its original size when the mouse pointer is no longer pointer to the node or after a predefined length of time.

The Examiner recognizes that Walker does not teach "in response to a mouse pointer leaving the predefined region, displaying the one or more of the nodes at a different magnification level relative to the other nodes of the network diagram; and in response to the mouse pointer leaving the predefined region, displaying the one or more nodes at a magnification level that is substantially the same for nodes within the network diagram that are not traversed by the mouse pointer." (Office Action, Feb. 26, 2007, p. 3.) The Examiner points to Steele for teaching magnification when a cursor is moved over an item. (see, e.g., Figures 2A-2C of Steele).

Claims 15, 19, and 21-27, as amended, recite "determining whether a scaling percentage (or factor) is below a threshold." If so, the claims recite "displaying one or more of the nodes at an increased magnification level" or "enlarging the node." Neither Walker nor Steele teaches or suggests determining whether a scaling is below a threshold and if so magnifying or enlarging. Walker, as the Examiner recognizes, is unrelated to magnifying. Although Steele describes enlarging an icon, it neither teaches nor suggests any determination as to whether the icon to be enlarged is below a threshold scaling. As such, these amended claims cannot be considered obvious in view of Walker and Steele.

Newly added claims 35-39 recite "when the displayed node . . . is displayed with an original scaling factor that is less than a threshold scaling factor, displaying the node . . . with an increased magnification." As discussed above, neither Walker nor Steele describes displaying a node with increased magnification when "the original scaling factor is less than a threshold scaling factor." Moreover, these claims further recite "determining whether a mouse pointer has hovered over a displayed node for more than a threshold amount of time." Such a determination prevents the magnifying of a node when the mouse pointer just happens to pass over a node for a fleeting amount of time. Neither Walker nor Steele suggests such a determination.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268823US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: May 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Maurice J. Pirio
Registration No.: 33,273
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant